

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/716,970	11/18/2003	Patrice Martinez	41052/294321	8909	
23370	7590 08/12/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP		DOSTER GREENE, DINNATIA JO			
	ITREE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA,	GA 30309		3743		

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\$K
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summans	10/716,970	MARTINEZ ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dinnatia Doster-Greene	3743	
 The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply 	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replevent of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute that the period for reply will, by statute that the months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. If the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ı.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 A	lovember 2003 and 02 February 2	<u>2004</u> .	
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 8-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3-7 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
			•
Attachment(s)			
)⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413) ate	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "(or two of the doors)" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,802) in view of Scherrer (U.S. Patent No. 6,886,713). In Figure 2, Patterson discloses an outdoor appliance

enclosure which is capable of functioning as a stowage box for an emergency breathing mask for the flight crew of an airplane. The box comprises a frame forming a receptacle which is capable of receiving the mask. The frame has an open face (22) through which the mask is inserted and extracted. At least two doors closing the open face of the frame.

Thus, Patterson discloses the claimed invention with the exception of at least in part, the two doors are hinged about two hinge axes situated respectively on two adjacent edges of the open face and substantially perpendicular to each other. However, Scherrer, which also relates to a storage compartment, teaches that it is known to build a storage compartment having dual axis so that the first axis is oriented substantially perpendicular to the second axis (Scherrer, Abstract and Fig. 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the dual axis of Scherrer into the enclosure of Patterson for the purpose of allowing convenient access to the contents of the enclosure of Patterson as taught by Scherrer (Scherrer, col. 1, liens 33-35).

Patterson also discloses having two doors each substantially in the form of a triangular plate, with a vertex having two sides forming a right angle, one of these sides being hinged about one of the two hinge axes. Patterson further teaches the concept of having an opening adapted to permit the appliance (i.e., mask and its lug handles) to extend there-through.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinnatia Doster-Greene whose telephone number is 571-272-7143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.
- 2. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-271-7143.

3. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ddg

Hery Sennett
Supervieury Patent Examiner
Green 3700